IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE NASHVILLE DIVISION

CAMARA SMITH, et al.,)
Plaintiffs,))
v.) Case No. 3:06-cv-00829
THE CHIPCOLCAND BACTORY) Judge Haynes
THE CHEESECAKE FACTORY) our en
RESTAURANTS, INC.,	Sarelyon the parties.
Defendant.	Judge Haynes ONNEN ONNEN Sacclique The parkers' Sacclique The parkers' July Hose Sychology (DIENS 191) Alos French 1505 N 160 Settlement is not ERATION OF ORDER REFERRING CASE TO MOUNT
	To kenew if the settlement is not
MOTION FOR PARTIAL RECONSIDERATION OF ORDER REFERRING CASE TO	
ARBITRATION BASED ON INTE	RVENING CHANGE IN LAW OR, IN THE
A DEPOSIT DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPERTY OF THE P	
ADJERIVATIVE, MOTION TO VACATE INTERIOR AWARD VIII OF ARBITRATOR	
IRV	TE INTERIM AWARD VIII OF ARBITRATOR WIN VENICK
	la alle

Introduction

On November 5, 2013, the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals decided *Reed Elsevier v. Crockett*, 734 F.3d 594 (6th Cir. 2013). *Crockett* held definitively that courts, not arbitrators, must decide whether an arbitration agreement that does not expressly waive the right of a claimant to proceed on a class basis nevertheless allows for it. *Id.* at 599. *Crockett* reversed prior Middle District of Tennessee authority to the contrary, and rejected the reading of earlier Supreme Court precedent upon which this Court based its 2010 decision to allow the arbitrators to decide the question of whether the parties' arbitration agreement permits class adjudication. [*See* Memorandum, Doc. 124 at p. 4 ("This issue as to whether the parties agreed to class arbitration is to be resolved by the arbitrator. See Green Tree Financial Corp. v. Bazzle, 539 U.S. 444, 452-45 (2003) (plurality opinion)")]. Consequently, the law in this Circuit now requires the Court, not the arbitrator, to determine whether an arbitration agreement provides for class arbitration.